arXiv:1605.05141v4 [math.CO] 20 Feb 2017

A user's guide to topological Tverberg conjecture *

A. Skopenkov †

Abstract

The well-known *topological Tverberg conjecture* was considered a central unsolved problem of topological combinatorics. The conjecture asserts that *for each integers $r, d > 1$ and each continuous map $f\colon \Delta \to \mathbb{R}^d$ of the $(d+1)(r-1)$-dimensional simplex Δ there are pairwise disjoint subsimplices $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \subset \Delta$ such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r) \neq \emptyset$.*

A proof for a prime power r was given by I. Bárány, S. Shlosman, A. Szűcs, M. Özaydin and A. Volovikov in 1981-1996. A counterexample for other r was found in a series of papers by M. Özaydin, M. Gromov, P. Blagojević, F. Frick, G. Ziegler, I. Mabillard and U. Wagner, most of them recent. (The exact description of contribution of particular authors is more complex and we provide more details in historical notes.)

The arguments form a beautiful and fruitful interplay between combinatorics, algebra and topology. In this expository note we present a simplified explanation of easier parts of the arguments, accessible to non-specialists in the area.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 **4**
2.1 Exercises on configuration spaces 4
2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 for r a prime: free actions 5
2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.1 for r a prime power: fixed point free actions 6

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2 **7**
3.1 Plan of the proof of Theorem 1.2 7
3.2 On references concerning Theorem 1.2 9
3.3 Proof of the Özaydin Theorem 3.5: localization modulo a prime 11
3.4 Proof of Proposition 3.6: finger moves 12
3.5 Proof of the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3: multiple Whitney trick 13

4 Appendix: comparison to another exposition **16**

1 Introduction

Some motivation. In this subsection we list classical results motivating the topological Tverberg conjecture. For history, more motivation and related problems see [BBZ, Zi11], [BZ, §1-§3], [Sk, §1.3 'Radon and Tverberg theorems']. This subsection is formally not used in the sequel.

*Research supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research Grant No. 15-01-06302, by Simons-IUM Fellowship and by the D. Zimin's Dynasty Foundation Grant.
Subsection 3.3 is written jointly with R. Karasev. I am grateful to P. Blagojević, V. Bragin, G. Kalai, R. Karasev, I. Mabillard, M. Tancer and U. Wagner for useful remarks, and to I. Mabillard and U. Wagner for allowing me to use some figures.

†Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, and Independent University of Moscow. Email: skopenko@mccme.ru. http://www.mccme.ru/~skopenko

A subset of the plane or of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called *convex*, if for any two points from this subset the segment joining these two points is in this subset. The *convex hull* of a subset X of the plane or $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the minimal convex set that contains X.

The well-known *Radon theorem* asserts that *for each integer $d > 0$ any $d + 2$ points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be decomposed into two groups such that the convex hulls of the groups intersect.*

This is generalized by *Tverberg theorem* stating that *for each integers integers $r, d > 1$ any $(d+1)(r-1)+1$ points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ can be decomposed into r groups such that all the r convex hulls of the groups have a common point.* Clearly, any $(d+1)(r-1)$ points in general position in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (or vertices of a d-simplex taken with multiplicity $r-1$) do not satisfy this property. So if one is bothered by remembering the number $(d+1)(r-1)+1$ from the Tverberg theorem, one can remember that this is the minimal number such that general position and calculation of the dimension of the intersection do not produce a counterexample.

The *topological Radon theorem* asserts that *for each integer $d > 0$ and each continuous map $f\colon \Delta_{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ of the $(d+1)$-dimensional simplex there are disjoint subsimplices $\sigma, \tau \subset \Delta_{d+1}$ whose f-images intersect.*



Figure 1: Linear and topological Tverberg Theorems for $r = 3$

The topological Tverberg conjecture and its resolution. Denote by Δ_N the N-dimensional simplex.

The well-known *topological Tverberg conjecture* was raised by E. Bajmoczy and I. Bárány [BB] and H. Tverberg [GS, Problem 84]. It was considered a central unsolved problem of topological combinatorics. The conjecture generalizes both the Tverberg theorem and the topological Radon theorem above. Namely, the conjecture asserts that *for each integers $r, d > 1$ and each continuous map $f\colon \Delta_{(d+1)(r-1)} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ there are pairwise disjoint subsimplices $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \subset \Delta_{(d+1)(r-1)}$ such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r) \neq \emptyset$.*

The conjecture was proved in the case where r is a prime [BShSz] or a prime power [Öz, Vo]. A counterexample for r not a prime power was found in a series of papers by M. Özaydin, M. Gromov, P. Blagojević, F. Frick, G. Ziegler, I. Mabillard and U. Wagner, most of them recent.[1] The arguments form a beautiful and fruitful interplay between combinatorics, algebra and topology.

Why this paper might be interesting. We present a simplified explanation of easier parts of the arguments (proving and disproving the topological Tverberg conjecture), and give reference to more complicated parts. Our exposition is accessible to non-specialists in the area. Our proof of r-fold Whitney trick (the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3) is simpler than the original one. In spite of being shorter, our exposition of other parts is not an alternative proof

[1]The exact description of contribution of particular authors is more complex and we provide more details in §3.2. We do not claim that the contributions were equal, but leave it to a reader to make his/her own opinion. M. de Longueville is not included in this list because Lemma 3.1 is used not to produce a counterexample, but to construct counterexamples for $d > 3r + 1$ from a counterexample for $d = 3r + 1$.

but just a different exposition making clear the structure and avoiding sophisticated language. If we use a theory, we state explicitly a result proved by this theory (§2, §3.3) in terms not involving this theory. This makes *application* of the result accessible to mathematicians not specialized in the theory; this also makes the proof and the theory more accessible. So if a statement is clear to a reader but the proof uses unknown notions, the reader can ignore the proof and go ahead using the statement. We also provide some historical details and remarks currently absent in other expositions [BBZ, BZ].

Definition of a geometric realization $|K|$. In this paper 'an (abstract) finite k-dimensional simplicial complex' is abbreviated to 'a k-complex'. Let K be a k-complex. Denote by V the set of its vertices. Define the *geometric realization* $|K|$ of K by

$$|K| := \{p : V \to [0, +\infty) \ : \ \sum_{v \in V} p(v) = 1, \ p^{-1}((0, +\infty)) \text{ is a simplex of } K\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\#V}.$$

Or, alternatively, take general position points $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $i \in V$, for some N, and define

$$|K| := \cup \{\text{conv}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}) \ : \ i_1, \dots, i_s \text{ is a simplex of } K\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Thus continuous or piecewise-linear (PL) maps $|K| \to \mathbb{R}^d$ are defined.



Figure 2: An almost 2-embedding $K_4 \to \mathbb{R}^2$

Definition of an almost r-embedding. A map $f\colon |K| \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an *almost r-embedding* if $f(\sigma_1) \cap \ldots \cap f(\sigma_r) = \emptyset$ whenever $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ are pairwise disjoint simplices of K. (We mostly omit 'continuous' for maps.)

Remark. (a) This definition depends on K, not only on $|K|$. However, below we abbreviate $|K|$ to K; no confusion should arise.

(b) In this language topological Tverberg conjecture states that *for each integers $r, d > 0$ the $(d+1)(r-1)$-simplex does not admit an almost r-embedding in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

(c) The notion of an almost 2-embedding first appeared in the Freedman-Krushkal-Teichner work on the Van Kampen obstruction [FKT].

(d) Any sufficiently small perturbation of an almost r-embedding is again an almost r-embedding. So the existence of a *continuous* almost r-embedding is equivalent to the existence of a *PL* almost r-embedding. Topological Tverberg conjecture means that this is also equivalent to the existence of a *linear* almost r-embedding, because the conjecture for *linear* maps is Tverberg Theorem above. Thus the conjecture is a higher-dimensional r-fold analogue of Fáry Theorem stating that *if a graph is planar, then it is linearly planar*, cf. [PW].

Theorem 1.1 ([BShSz, Öz, Vo])**.** *If r is a prime power, then there are no almost r-embeddings of the $(d+1)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Theorem 1.2 ([Öz, Gr10, BFZ14, Fr, MW])**.** *There is an almost 6-embedding of the 100-dimensional simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{19}$.*

More generally, if r is not a prime power and $d \geq 3r+1$, then there is an almost r-embedding of the $(d+1)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

See counterexamples for lower d in [AMSW]. The topological Tverberg conjecture is still open for low dimensions $d < 12$, in particular, for $d = 2$. Another challenging questions are

existence of an almost r-embedding of a $(d+1)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, or of a $[(d+1)(r-1)+1]$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$, cf. [MW', MW16], [BFZ, §5]. (For a criticism of [MW', MW16] see [Sk'].)

Sections 2 and 3 are independent on each other.

Important notation. Denote $D^n := [0,1]^n$ and $S^{n-1} := \partial D^n$. A complex Y is called *k-connected* if for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ any map $f : S^j \to Y$ extends over D^{j+1}.

Let us introduce the main notion used in the proof (§2, §3.3).

The *deleted product* $\widetilde{K} = \widetilde{K}^2$ of a complex K is the product of K with itself, minus the diagonal:

$$\widetilde{K} := \{(x, y) \in K \times K \mid x \neq y\}.$$

This is the configuration space of ordered pairs of distinct points of K.



Figure 3: The deleted product and the Gauss map

Now suppose that $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is an embedding. Then the map $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{K} \to S^{m-1}$ is well-defined by the Gauss formula

$$\widetilde{f}(x, y) = \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{|f(x) - f(y)|}.$$

This map is equivariant with respect to the 'exchanging factors' involution $(x, y) \to (y, x)$ on $\widetilde{K}$ and the antipodal involution on S^{m-1}, i.e. $\widetilde{f}(y, x) = -\widetilde{f}(x, y)$. Thus the existence of an equivariant map $\widetilde{K} \to S^{m-1}$ is a necessary condition for the embeddability of K in $\mathbb{R}^m$. For results on its sufficiency (not used in this paper) see [Sk08, §5].

Denote by Σ_r the permutation group of r elements. The group Σ_r acts on the set of real $d \times r$-matrices by permuting the columns. Denote by $S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ the set of such matrices with sum in each row zero, and the sum of squares of the matrix elements is 1. This set is homeomorphic to the sphere of dimension $d(r-1)-1$. This set is invariant under the action of Σ_r.

The *simplicial r-fold deleted product* of a complex K is

$$\widetilde{K}^r := \bigcup \{\sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_r \ : \sigma_i \text{ a simplex of } K,\ \sigma_i \cap \sigma_j = \emptyset \text{ for every } i \neq j\},$$

i.e., is the union of products $\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r$ formed by pairwise disjoint simplices of K [Ma]. A nice alternative notation for $\widetilde{K}^r$ would be $K^{\underline{r}}$, because by $n^{\underline{r}} := n(n-1)\dots(n-r+1)$ one denotes the number of ordered r-tuples of pairwise different elements of an n-element set.

The set $\widetilde{K}^r \subset K^r$ has no natural structure of a simplicial complex, but $\widetilde{K}^r$ is obviously composed of products of simplices and is therefore a polyhedron. The set $\widetilde{K}^r$ has the natural action of Σ_r, permuting the points in the r-tuple $(p_1, \dots, p_r)$. This action is evidently free.

The existence of an equivariant map $\widetilde{K}^r \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ is a necessary condition for the existence of an almost r-embedding $K \to \mathbb{R}^m$, analogously to the Configuration Space Lemma below. For results on this condition see the Özaydin Theorem 3.5, the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 3.6.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

2.1 Exercises on configuration spaces

These exercises help a beginner in this area to get accustomed. They are not used in the proof.

2.1. (a) Alice and Bob stand in vertices A, B of the triangle ABC. They can walk continuously along the edges of the triangle, so that each moment one of them is in a vertex, and the other is on the opposite edge. Can they exchange their positions?

(b) Alice, Bob and Claude stand in vertices A, B, C of the tetrahedron $ABCD$. They can walk continuously along the edges of the tetrahedron, so that each moment two of them are in two different vertices, and the third is on the opposite edge. Can they move to vertices D, B, A, respectively?

Recall that $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^3$ is the set of ordered triples (x, y, z) of points of the N-simplex Δ_N lying in pairwise disjoint simplices. E.g. $\widetilde{\Delta_1}^3 = \emptyset$ and the set $\widetilde{\Delta_2}^3$ has 6 elements.

2.2. (a) Represent $\widetilde{\Delta_3}^3$ as a union of arcs. Which graph is obtained?

(b) Represent $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ as a union of triangles and squares. Which polyhedron (or rather cell complex) is obtained?

(c) Represent $\widetilde{\Delta_5}^3$ as a union of products of simplices. How many k-cells the obtained cell complex has, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$?

(d) Represent $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^3$ as a union of products of simplices. What is the dimension of the obtained cell complex?

2.3. (a) Take the cycle

$$(1,2,3)(1,2,4)(1,3,4)(2,3,4)(2,3,5)(2,4,5)(3,4,5)(3,4,1)(3,5,1)(4,5,1)\ldots(1,2,3)$$

formed by edges of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$. Find some faces of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ such that each edge of the cycle is contained in an odd number of those faces, and each other edge of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ is contained in an even number of those faces (i.e. the mod 2 sum of the boundaries of the faces is given cycle).

(b) Prove that each cycle formed by edges of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ is the mod 2 sum of the boundaries of some faces of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$.

(c) Prove that each oriented cycle formed by edges of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ is the sum of the oriented boundaries with certain integer coefficients of some oriented faces of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$.

(d) Suppose that $b_1 \ldots b_k$ is the boundary of a 2-dimensional face of a cell complex. Replacement of a part $b_1 \ldots b_l$ of a cycle formed by edges of the cell complex (for $1 \le l < k$) by $b_1 b_k b_{k-1} \ldots b_{l+1} b_l$ is called *elementary homotopy*. Prove that any two such cycles formed by edges of $\widetilde{\Delta_4}^3$ can be joined by a sequence of elementary homotopies (i.e. are *homotopic*).

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 for r a prime: free actions

Our exposition is based on the well-structured and clearly written paper [BShSz].

Recall the notation defined at the end of §1.

Lemma 2.4 (Configuration Space)**.** *For each r, N, d if $f\colon \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous map of the N-simplex Δ_N and $f(\sigma_1) \cap \ldots \cap f(\sigma_r) = \emptyset$ for each pairwise disjoint faces $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r \subset \Delta_N$, then there is a Σ_r-equivariant map $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r \to S^{(r-1)d-1}_{\Sigma_r}$.*

Proof. (We present the argument for $r = 3$. The case of arbitrary r, not necessarily a prime, is proved analogously.) The group Σ_3 acts freely on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^3 - \mathrm{diag}$, where $\mathrm{diag} := \{(x, x, x) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^3 \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. The required map is constructed as a composition

$$\widetilde{\Delta_N}^3 \xrightarrow{f^3} (\mathbb{R}^d)^3 - \mathrm{diag} \xrightarrow{\pi} S^{2d-1}_{\Sigma_3}.$$

Here

• the equivariant map f^3 is well-defined because of the condition '$f(\sigma_1) \cap f(\sigma_2) \cap f(\sigma_3) = \emptyset$'.

• π is the projection to the subspace orthogonal to the diagonal; formally, for $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which are not all equal define

$$\pi' := (\ 2x_1 - x_2 - x_3,\ 2x_2 - x_1 - x_3,\ 2x_3 - x_1 - x_2\ ) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi := \frac{\pi'}{|\pi'|}.$$

□

Theorem 2.5 (Analogue of the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem)**.** *Let X be a $(k+1)$-dimensional k-connected complex, r a prime number, $\omega_X : X \to X$, $\omega_S : S^k \to S^k$ cellular maps without fixed points such that $\omega_X^r = \mathrm{id}\, X$ and $\omega_S^r = \mathrm{id}\, S^k$. Then there are no maps $f : X \to S^k$ such that $f \circ \omega_X = \omega_S \circ f$.*

Comments on the proof. Since X is k-connected and ω_X is cellular, there is a map $g : S^k \to X$ such that $g \circ \omega_S = \omega_X \circ g$. Then the composition $f \circ g : S^k \to S^k$ extend over D^{k+1} and commutes with ω_S. The non-existence of such map is in turn an analogue of the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem. It is proved analogously to the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem [BShSz, Lemma 2]. In [Ma] an alternative proof (using *Lefschetz trace formula*) and a further generalization (*Dold Theorem*) are presented. □

Lemma 2.6 (Connectivity; [BShSz])**.** *For each r, N the complex $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r$ is $(N-r)$-connected.*

Comments on the proof. By the Hurewicz Theorem it suffices to prove that $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r$ is 1-connected and $H_j(\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for each $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, N-r\}$. This is proved analogously to exercises 2.3.d,c. See [BShSz, Lemma 1]. See alternative proof in [BZ]. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1 for a prime r. Let $N := (r-1)(d+1)$. Then $N - r = (r-1)d - 1$. Suppose to the contrary that $f\colon \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous map such that $f(\sigma_1) \cap \ldots \cap f(\sigma_r) = \emptyset$ for each pairwise disjoint faces $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r \subset \Delta_N$. Take a Σ_r-equivariant map $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r \to S^{(r-1)d-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ given by the Configuration Space Lemma 2.4. The 'cyclic shift of r-tuples by one' self-map $\omega_{\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r}$ of $\widetilde{\Delta_N}^r$ does not have fixed points. Since r is a prime, the 'cyclic shift of columns by one' self-map ω_S of $S^{(r-1)d-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ does not have fixed points. So by the analogue of the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem 2.5 for $k = N - r$ and $X = \widetilde{\Delta_N}^r$ we obtain a contradiction to the Connectivity Lemma 2.6. □

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.1 for r a prime power: fixed point free actions

Our exposition is based on [Vo, §2], [Öz, §2,§3]; see alternative proofs in [Vo', Zi98, Sa].

Recall the notation defined at the end of §1. An action is called *fixed point free* if the space has no points fixed by *each* element of the group.

Theorem 2.7 (Analogue of the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem)**.** *[Vo, Lemma], [Öz, Lemma 3.3]. Let X be a $(k+1)$-dimensional k-connected $\mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$-complex, where α is a positive integer. For each fixed point free action of $\mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$ on S^k there are no $\mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$-equivariant maps $X \to S^k$.*

This is deduced below from Lemma 2.8 and Localization Theorem 2.9.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the subgroup G of Σ_r formed by all permutations preserving $\{kp^s + 1, kp^s + 2, \dots, (k+1)p^s\}$ for each $s = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha - 1$ and $k = 0, 1, \dots, p^{\alpha - s} - 1$. Clearly, $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$. Denote $N := (d+1)(r-1)$. The Theorem now follows analogously to the case of prime r by the Configuration Space Lemma 2.4, analogue of the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem 2.7 for $k = N - r$ and $X = \widetilde{\Delta_N}^r$, together with the Connectivity Lemma 2.6, because X is clearly $(N - r + 1)$-dimensional. □

The following Lemma holds for any coefficients, but is used for coefficients $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

Lemma 2.8. *(a) If X is a $(k+1)$-dimensional k-connected complex and $X \to E \to B$ is a bundle, then $p^* : H^{k+1}(B) \to H^{k+1}(E)$ is injective.*

(b) If $S^k \to E \to B$ is a bundle over a connected base B, $\pi_1(B)$ acts trivially on $H^k(S^k)$ and $p^*_{k+1} : H^{k+1}(B) \to H^{k+1}(E)$ is injective, then $p^*_j : H^j(B) \to H^j(E)$ is injective for each j.

Proof. The Lemma is a standard exercise in spectral or Gysin sequences. A reader could use the statement of the lemma without proof, and then omit the proof.

In order to prove (a) consider the Serre spectral sequence [FF, §21] for which $E_2^{i,j} \cong H^i(B, H^j(X)_T)$. Since $H^j(X) = 0$ unless $j \in \{0, k+1\}$, there are no non-trivial differentials $d_s^{i,j} : E_s^{i,j} \to E_s^{i+s,j-s+1}$ to or from

$$H^{k+1}(B) \cong E_2^{k+1,0} = E_3^{k+1,0} = \ldots = E_\infty^{k+1,0}.$$

Thus p^* is the composition of these isomorphisms and the inclusion $E_\infty^{k+1,0} \to H^{k+1}(E)$. So p^* is injective.

In order to prove (b) look at the following segment of the Gysin exact sequence [FF, §22.4.A]:

$$H^{j-k-1}(B) \stackrel{d_j}{\to} H^j(B) \stackrel{p_j^*}{\to} H^j(E),$$

where $d_j(x) := x \cup e$ for the characteristic class $e \in H^{k+1}(B)$ of the bundle. Since p_{k+1}^* is injective, $d_{k+1} = 0$, so $e = 0$. Hence for each j we have that $d_j = 0$ and p_j^* is injective. □

For G-complexes A, X define an action of G on $A \times X$ by $g(a, x) := (g(a), g(x))$. Define [2]

$$\overline{X}_A := (A \times X)/G \quad \text{and define} \quad \pi_X = \pi_{X,A} : \overline{X}_A \to A/G \quad \text{by} \quad \pi[a, x] := [a].$$

Theorem 2.9. *[Di, Proposition III.3.14] For each prime p, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $G := \mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$ there is an infinite free G-complex $E = E_G$ such that*

- *for each G-complex X the map π_X is a bundle;*
- *for each fixed point free action of G on S^k and some $j > 0$ the map $\pi_{S^k}^* : H^j(E/G; \mathbb{Z}_p) \to H^j(\overline{S^k}_E; \mathbb{Z}_p)$ is not injective.*

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Let $G := \mathbb{Z}_p^\alpha$. Assume to the contrary that there is a G-equivariant map $f : X \to S^k$. Take a complex E given by Theorem 2.9. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{X}_E & \xrightarrow{\overline{f}=(\mathrm{id}\, E \times f)/G} & \overline{S^k}_E \\ & {\scriptstyle \pi_X} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \pi_{S^k}} & \\ & E/G & \end{array}$$

Here $\overline{f}$ is well-defined by $\overline{f}[a, x] := [a, f(x)]$. Apply Lemma 2.8.a to the bundle π_X. We obtain that π_X induces an injection in $H^{k+1}(\cdot; \mathbb{Z}_p)$. By the commutativity the map π_{S^k} also induces an injection in $H^{k+1}(\cdot; \mathbb{Z}_p)$. A self-homeomorphism of S^k of order p induces an isomorphism of $H^k(S^k; \mathbb{Z}_p)$. Hence $\pi_1(E/G)$ acts trivially on $H^k(S^k; \mathbb{Z}_p)$. Apply Lemma 2.8.b to the bundle π_{S^k}. We obtain a contradiction to Theorem 2.9. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

3.1 Plan of the proof of Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 follows from Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 below.

The following lemma shows that it suffices to prove Theorem 1.2 for $d = 3r + 1$.

Lemma 3.1. *If r is a positive integer and there is an almost r-embedding $\Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$, then there is an almost r-embedding $\Delta_{N+r-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. [Lo, Proposition 2.5]*

[2] A reader need not be familiar with the Borel construction because all the necessary definitions and statements are given and are short.

Proof. Cf. proof of Lemma 3.2. Let $f : \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be an almost r-embedding. Let $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{N+1}$ be vertices of Δ_N and $e_{N+2}, \dots, e_{N+r}$ additional vertices of Δ_{N+r-1}. Define $F : \Delta_{N+r-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ to be a join of f and the map that maps $e_{N+2}, \dots, e_{N+r}$ to $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Formally,

$$F\left(\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} t_i e_i + (1-\lambda) \sum_{i=N+2}^{N+r} t_i e_i\right) := \left(\lambda f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} t_i e_i\right), 1-\lambda\right)$$

$$\text{for each} \quad \lambda, t_1, \dots, t_{N+r} \geq 0 \text{ such that } \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} t_i = \sum_{i=N+2}^{N+r} t_i = 1.$$

Assume to the contrary that F is not an almost r-embedding, i.e. there are pairwise disjoint simplices $\widehat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \widehat{\sigma}_r$ of Δ_{N+r-1} such that $X := F(\widehat{\sigma}_1) \cap \dots \cap F(\widehat{\sigma}_r) \neq \emptyset$. At least one of these r simplices has no vertices among $r-1$ points $e_{N+2}, \dots, e_{N+r}$. Hence $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times 0$ and $\emptyset \neq X = f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r)$, where $\sigma_k := \Delta_N \cap \widehat{\sigma}_k$ for each $k = 1, \dots, r$ are pairwise disjoint simplices of Δ_N. A contradiction. □

The next lemma shows that Theorem 1.2 is implied by the following assertion for each r that is not a prime power.

(VKF_r) *There is an almost r-embedding of each $3(r-1)$-complex in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$.* [3]

Lemma 3.2 (Constraint; Gromov-Blagojević-Frick-Ziegler)**.** *If r is a positive integer and there is an almost r-embedding of the $3(r-1)$-skeleton of the $(3r+2)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$, then there is an almost r-embedding of the $(3r+2)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{3r+1}$. [Gr10, 2.9.c], [BFZ14, Lemma 4.1.iii and 4.2], [Fr, proof of Theorem 4]*

Proof. Cf. proof of Lemma 3.1. Denote $N := (r-1)(3r+2)$. Take an almost r-embedding $\Delta_N^{(3(r-1))} \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ of the $3(r-1)$-skeleton of the N-simplex. Extend it arbitrarily to a map $f : \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$. Denote by $\rho(x)$ the distance from $x \in \Delta_N$ to the $3(r-1)$-skeleton. It suffices to prove that $f \times \rho : \Delta_N \to \mathbb{R}^{3r+1}$ is an almost r-embedding.

Suppose to the contrary that r points $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \Delta_N$ lie in pairwise disjoint simplices and are mapped to the same point under $f \times \rho$. Dimension of one of those faces does not exceed $\frac{N+1}{r} - 1$, so it is at most $3(r-1)$. W.l.o.g. this is the first face, hence $\rho(x_1) = 0$. Then $\rho(x_2) = \dots = \rho(x_r) = \rho(x_1) = 0$, i.e. $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \Delta_N^{(3(r-1))}$. Therefore $f(x_1) = \dots = f(x_r)$ contradicts to the fact that $f|_{\Delta_N^{(3(r-1))}}$ is an almost r-embedding. □

Definition of a global r-fold point, r-intersection sign and $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding. Let K be a $k(r-1)$-complex.

We call a point $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a *global r-fold point* of a map $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^d$ if y has r preimages lying in pairwise disjoint simplices of K, i.e., $y \in f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r)$ and $\sigma_i \cap \sigma_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.

(Thus, f is an almost r-embedding if and only if it has no global r-fold points.)



$$f(\sigma_1) \cdot f(\sigma_2) = 0$$

Figure 4: Global 2-fold points and their 2-intersection signs

[3] This is an assertion rather than a theorem: it holds for r that is not a prime power, but not otherwise. The negation of assertion (VKF_r) is called *generalized van Kampen-Flores assertion* (or, rather, (VKF_r) is a particular case of that assertion). See [Gr10, 2.9.c] and a clearer formulation in [BZ, Theorems 4.1 and 5.4].



Figure 5: A global 3-fold point and its 3-intersection sign; a local 3-fold point

Assume that $\dim K = k(r-1)$ for some $k \geq 1$, $r \geq 2$, and $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^{kr}$ is a PL map in general position. Then preimages $y_1, \dots, y_r \in K$ of any global r-fold point $y \in \mathbb{R}^{kr}$ lye in the interiors of pairwise $k(r-1)$-dimensional simplex of K. Choose arbitrarily an orientation for each of these $k(r-1)$-simplices. By general position, f is affine on a neighborhood U_j of y_j for each $j = 1, \dots, r$. Take the positive base of k vectors in the oriented normal space to oriented fU_j. *The r-intersection sign* of y is the sign ± 1 of the base in $\mathbb{R}^{kr}$ formed by r such k-bases.

(This is classical for $r = 2$ [BE] and is analogous for $r \geq 3$, cf. [MW, § 2.2].)

We call f a *$\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding* if the sum $f(\sigma_1) \bullet \dots \bullet f(\sigma_r) \in \mathbb{Z}$ of the r-intersection signs of all global r-fold points $y \in f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r)$ is zero, whenever $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ are pairwise disjoint simplices of K. The sign of the algebraic r-intersection number depends on an arbitrary choice of orientations for each σ_i, but this condition does not. (Observe that an $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding is automatically a PL general position map.)

The following two results prove (VKF_r) for each r that is not a prime power.

Theorem 3.3 (Mabillard-Wagner)**.** *If r is a positive integer and there is a $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding of a $3(r-1)$-complex K in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$, then there is an almost r-embedding of K in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$.*

This result follows from [MW, Theorem 7]; in §3.5 we outline a simpler proof [AMSW, §2].

Theorem 3.4. *If r is not a prime power, then there is a $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding of each $3(r-1)$-complex in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$.*

This is a combination of results of Özaydin and Mabillard-Wagner. Recall the notation defined at the end of §1. For a $3(r-1)$-complex K we have $\dim \widetilde{K}^r \leq r \dim K = 3r(r-1)$. So Theorem 3.4 is implied by the following Özaydin Theorem 3.5 for $d = 3r$ and Proposition 3.6.

Theorem 3.5 (Özaydin)**.** *If r is not a prime power and X is a polyhedron with a free PL action of Σ_r, and $\dim X \leq d(r-1)$, then there is a Σ_r-equivariant map $X \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$.*

In §3.3 we present an exposition much clearer than the original exposition.

Proposition 3.6 (see §3.4)**.** *Let K be a $3(r-1)$-complex. There is a $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding of K in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$ if and only if there is a Σ_r-equivariant map $\widetilde{K}^r \to S^{3r(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$. [MW, § 4.1 and Corollary 44]*

The remaining subsections of this section are independent on each other.

3.2 On references concerning Theorem 1.2

The Constraint Lemma 3.2 (or, in Gromov's formulation, *'the topological Tverberg theorem, whenever available, implies the van Kampen-Flores theorem'* [Gr10, 2.9.c, p. 445-446]) was

proved in [Gr10, 2.9.c, p.446, 2nd paragraph] [4] and, independently, in [BFZ14, Lemma 4.1.iii and 4.2], [Fr, proof of Theorem 4]. In [BFZ14, BZ] the Constraint Lemma 3.2 is not explicitly stated but is implicitly proved in the proof of other results. Thus the lemma is proved separately for r a prime power [BFZ14, Lemma 4.1.iii and 4.2], [BZ, §4.1] or not [Fr, proof of Theorem 4], [BZ, §5], although neither case of the lemma uses the fact that r is a prime power or not.

The Özaydin Theorem 3.5 was not stated in [Öz] but easily follows from [Öz] as it was shown in [Fr, proof of Corollary 3], cf. [MW14, p. 173, the paragraph before Theorem 3]. Proposition 3.6 is a generalization [MW, § 4.1 and Corollary 44] of known results.

The Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3 is the most non-trivial part of disproof of topological Tverberg conjecture. Their idea is similar to, but different from, 'Haefliger's h-principle for embeddings' [Gr86, 2.1.1, (E), p. 50-51], [Sk08, §5] (for 'h-principle' itself see [Gr86, p. 3]) and to Whitney trick [RS, Whitney Lemma 5.12]. The *r-fold* analogues of Haefliger's h-principle for embeddings and of Whitney trick were 'in the air' since 1960s [Sk08, §5.6 'The Generalized Haefliger-Wu invariant']. 'Positive results' were available for links, and an argument involving triple Whitney trick was sketched by S. Melikhov [Me]. The problem [Gr10, end of 2.9.c, p. 446] (cited as [AMSW, Remark 1.11.c]) suggests that Gromov was aware that (VKF_r) might hold for each r that is not a prime power, to the extent of asking the right question. However, some counterexamples were known [Sk08, §5.6]. So r-fold analogue of Haefliger's h-principle for *almost* r-embeddings and of the Whitney trick is an important contribution of Mabillard and Wagner. Their r-fold Whitney trick involves analogue of increasing the connectivity (surgery) of the intersection set [Ha63], [HK, Theorem 4.5 and appendix A], [CRS, Theorem 4.7 and appendix]. In other words, this is first attaching an embedded 1-handle along an arc ('piping') and then attaching a canceling embedded 2-handle along a disk ('unpiping') [Ha62, §3], [Me, proof of Theorem 1.1 in p. 7]. (We apply [Ha62, Proposition 3.3] for $r = 0$ and $r = 1$; both times we pass from embedding into $B \times 0$ to embedding into $B \times 1$.) Application of these constructions is non-trivial and is an important achievement of Mabillard and Wagner.

An approach to Theorem 1.2, i.e. to refuting the topological Tverberg conjecture for r not a prime power, was suggested by Mabillard and Wagner [MW14]. Their idea was to prove and extend (VKF_r) via Theorem 3.4 (or rather via the Özaydin Theorem 3.5). There seemed to be a serious obstacle to completing this approach: maps from the $(d+1)(r-1)$-simplex to $\mathbb{R}^d$ do not satisfy the codimension ≥ 3 restriction required for (VKF_r). These maps have actually negative codimension. Frick [Fr] was the first to realize that this obstacle can be overcome by a beautiful combinatorial trick (the Constraint Lemma 3.2). As far as I know [BFZ, §1], [BZ, §1 and beginning of §5], [Ka], at the time the paper [Fr] appeared no mathematician within community of topological combinatorics was aware that the lemma was earlier explicitly proved by Gromov [Gr10], [5] and, independently and implicitly by Blagojević–Frick–Ziegler [BFZ14]. (See above detailed explanation of references for the Constraint Lemma 3.2.) Thus the results of [Öz], [Gr10, BFZ14, Fr] and [MW] combined yield counterexamples to the topological Tverberg conjecture for $d = 3r+1$ whenever r is not a prime power. (Note that in [Öz, Gr10, BFZ14, MW] many other results not mentioned here are proved.) The historical order of *first arxiv publications* is different from the above-described historical order of *seminar or conference announcements*. At the time of writing, the results [Öz, MW] are not published in refereed journals.

A reader might want to compare the above description of references and historical remarks to those in [BBZ, the first paragraph in p. 733 and 'Counterexamples' in p. 737], [BFZ, §1], [BZ, §1 and beginning of §5], [JVZ, §1.1], [MW, §1], [Si, §1] and [AMSW, Remark 1.6.a]. Cf. §4.

[4] The statement in [Gr10, 2.9.c] (of a more general result involving a typo) is hard to read. So note that
• the number $T_{top}(q, n)$ is the number of topological Tverberg partitions, see [Gr10, p. 444 above an the third paragraph of 2.9.a];
• instead of $T_{top}(q, n)$ there should be $T_{top}(q, n+1)$;
• The Constraint Lemma 3.2 is obtained by taking $q = r$, $k = 3(r-1)$, $n = 3r$, $N = N_{qn} = N_{nq} = (3r+2)(r-1)$, and using '$T_{top}(q, n+1) > 0 \ \Rightarrow \ m(q, n) > 0$' not stronger inequality $[VKF]_q$.

[5] It is interesting to note that rediscovery of the Constraint Lemma 3.2 after [Gr10, 2.9.c] required quite an effort, although [Gr10, 2.9.e] was discussed during the problem session at 2012 Oberwolfach Workshop on Triangulations.

3.3 Proof of the Özaydin Theorem 3.5: localization modulo a prime

The idea is to deduce the Özaydin Theorem 3.5 from its local version 'away from a prime p'.

We use the following well-known results of the group theory and the equivariant obstruction theory whose proof we sketch below for the reader's convenience.

Denote the order of p in $r! = |\Sigma_r|$ by

$$\alpha_p = \alpha_{p,r} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{r}{p^k} \right\rfloor .$$

The following Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 are well-known; we sketch their proofs for completeness below.

Lemma 3.7 (a particular case of Sylow theorem)**.** *For any integer r there is a subgroup G of Σ_r having p^{α_p} elements.*

Remark. The simplest counterexample to topological Tverberg conjecture is obtained for $r = 6$, when the subgroups of Lemma 3.7 have a very simple description:

• $p = 5$, $G = \mathbb{Z}_5 < S_5 < S_6$ (= the subgroup preserving the splitting $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\} = \{1,2,3,4,5\} \cup \{6\}$ and acting in a cyclic way on $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$);

• $p = 3$, $G = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 < S_3 \times S_3 < S_6$ (= the subgroup preserving the splitting $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\} = \{1,2,3\} \cup \{4,5,6\}$ and acting in a cyclic way on both $\{1,2,3\}$ and $\{4,5,6\}$);

• $p = 2$, G is the subgroup preserving the splittings $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\} = \{1,2,3,4\} \cup \{5,6\}$ and $\{1,2,3,4\} = \{1,2\} \cup \{3,4\}$.

Lemma 3.8 (Obstruction)**.** *Let r be any integer and X a $d(r-1)$-polyhedron with a free PL action of Σ_r. Then to each subgroup G of Σ_r there corresponds a group H_G and an element $e(G) \in H_G$ so that*

(*) $e(G) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$ there is a G-equivariant map $X \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$;

(**) there is a homomorphism $\tau : H_G \to H_{\Sigma_r}$ such that $\tau e(G) = [\Sigma_r : G] e(\Sigma_r)$.

Proof of the Özaydin Theorem 3.5. If $\dim X < d(r-1)$, then the existence of an equivariant map $X \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ follows because $S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ is $(d(r-1)-2)$-connected. Now assume that $\dim X = d(r-1)$.

Take any prime p. Take a subgroup G of Σ_r given by Lemma 3.7 (the p-Sylow subgroup). The group G cannot act transitively on $\{1,2,\dots,r\}$, otherwise this would be a coset of the p-group G and would have order a power of p. Hence we can assume that G preserves the sets $\{1,\dots,k\}$ and $\{k+1,\dots,r\}$ of indices.

This gives a G-invariant $d \times r$-matrix M of d lines

$$(\underbrace{k-r,\dots,k-r}_{k},\underbrace{k,\dots,k}_{r-k}).$$

Then the point $M/|M| \in S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ is G-invariant. Then a G-equivariant map $X \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ is defined by mapping X to the G-invariant point. Then by the Obstruction Lemma 3.8, the '$\Leftarrow$' direction of (*) and (**), $\dfrac{r!}{p^{\alpha_p}} e(\Sigma_r) = \tau e(G) = 0$.

Since r is not a prime power, the numbers $\dfrac{r!}{p^{\alpha_p}}$, for all prime divisors p of $r!$, have no common multiple. So $e(\Sigma_r) = 0$. Now the Theorem follows by the Obstruction Lemma 3.8, the '$\Rightarrow$' direction of (*). □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Construction of a tree T whose leaves are numbered by $0,1,\dots,r-1$. Take an integer ℓ such that $p^\ell < r < p^{\ell+1}$. Denote by T_0 the graded tree whose vertices are words in the alphabet $0,1,\dots,p-1$ having at most $\ell+1$ letters, and the children of a vertex w are those words that can be obtained from w by adding a letter to the right. The word $a_1a_2a_3\dots a_{\ell+1}$ is p-adic expansion of the number

$$\overline{a_{\ell+1}\dots a_3a_2a_1} = a_1 + a_2p + a_3p^2 + \dots + a_{\ell+1}p^\ell \quad (\text{possibly } a_{\ell+1} = 0).$$

Denote by T the tree obtained from T_0 by deleting all the vertices that have no descendant whose number is less than r (in particular, deleting all the vertices whose numbers are greater or equal to r). This gives a strictly smaller tree because $r < p^{\ell+1}$.

Construction of G. If there are p children of a given vertex $v \in T$ then order them in the cyclic way as residues modulo p. If there are less than p children of v then order them linearly according to their last letter. *The leaves of grade $\ell+1$, or on the level $\ell+1$* of T are all $(\ell+1)$-letter words. Let G be the group of automorphisms of T that preserve the grade and the described (cyclic or linear) order of children of every vertex.

Proof that $|G| = p^{\alpha_p}$. First, take all vertices of level ℓ (i.e., all parents of the leaves) and independently rotate their children, if the children have a cyclic order. In total, there are $p^{\left\lfloor \frac{r}{p} \right\rfloor}$ such rotations. Second, rotate the cyclic children of level $\ell-1$ vertices, with $p^{\left\lfloor \frac{r}{p^2} \right\rfloor}$ possibilities, and so on. Every element of G can be build this way by rotating the children of the vertices starting from the bottom and going to the top of the tree; this shows that $|G| = p^{\alpha_p}$. □

Sketch of a proof of the Obstruction Lemma 3.8. A reader could use the statement of the lemma without proof, and then omit the proof.

Let $H_G := H_G^{(r-1)d}(X;\mathbb{Z})$ be the *G-equivariant (=G-symmetric) cohomology group* w.r.t. the action of G on X and the 'multiplication by the sign' action of G on $\mathbb{Z}$. This group and the element $e(G) \in H_G$ are defined by trying to construct an G-equivariant map $X \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ by skeleta of some G-invariant trianguation of X. See for the details [Hu, Sk15, Sk] in the non-equivariant setting and [Di] in the equivariant setting. [6]

Since $\dim X = (r-1)d$, we obtain (*).

Let $\operatorname{forg} : H_{\Sigma_r} \to H_G$ be the 'forgetting symmetry' homomorphism. Clearly, $e(G) = \operatorname{forg} e(\Sigma_r)$.

The property (**) follows because there is a homomorphism $\tau : H_G \to H_{\Sigma_r}$ such that $\tau \circ \operatorname{forg}$ is the multiplication by $[\Sigma_r : G]$. In order to define such a map τ (a *transfer* homomorphism) let us define a map $t : C_G^{(r-1)d}(X;\mathbb{Z}) \to C_{\Sigma_r}^{(r-1)d}(X;\mathbb{Z})$ of the *simplicial cochain groups*. Let $s := [\Sigma_r : G]$ and take $f_1, \dots, f_s \in \Sigma_r$ such that $\Sigma_r = f_1 G \sqcup \dots \sqcup f_s G$. For a simplex σ of the G-invariant triangulation of X define

$$t(x)(\sigma) = x(f_1\sigma)\operatorname{sgn} f_1 + \dots + x(f_s\sigma)\operatorname{sgn} f_s.$$

Extend $t(x)$ to a cochain by linearity. It is easy to check that t defines the required map τ in cohomology, see [Br], [BLZ, §5.2] for the details. □

3.4 Proof of Proposition 3.6: finger moves

Before proving the equivalence we reformulate both conditions in terms of linear algebra (more precisely, in terms of *cohomology obstruction theory*), and relate the reformulations.

Denote $d := 3r$. Take any

- orientations on $(d-3)$-simplices of K;
- general position PL map $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^d$;
- collection $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ of pairwise disjoint $(d-3)$-simplices of K.

Definition of $v(f)$. Let $v(f)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ be the sum of the r-intersection signs of all r-fold points $y \in f(\sigma_1) \cap \dots \cap f(\sigma_r)$. The sum depends on the orientations, but we omit them from the notation.

Clearly, f is a $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding if and only if the r-dimensional 'matrix' $v(f)$ (*the intersection cocycle*) has only zero entries, i.e. $v(f) = 0$.

Definition of $o(f)$. Cf. proof of the Configuration Space Lemma 2.4 in §2. For $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which are not all equal define

$$S := x_1 + \dots + x_n, \quad \pi' := \left(x_1 - \frac{S}{n}, \dots, x_n - \frac{S}{n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi := \frac{\pi'}{|\pi'|}.$$

[6] This definition implies that $e(\Sigma_r) = -e(\Sigma_r)$, i.e. $2e(\Sigma_r) = 0$, for each even r.
Alternatively, $H_G = H^{(r-1)d}((X \times E_G)/G;\mathbb{Z})$, where E_G is the complex from the Localization Theorem 2.9.

This defines a map

$$\pi : (\mathbb{R}^d)^r - \mathrm{diag} \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathrm{diag} := \{(x, x, \dots, x) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^r \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

By general position $f^r\partial(\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r) \subset (\mathbb{R}^d)^r - \mathrm{diag}$, so we obtain the map

$$\pi \circ f^r : \partial(\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r) \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}.$$

Let $o(f)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) := \deg(\pi \circ f^r|_{\partial(\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r)})$. Clearly, the map $\pi \circ f^r$ extends to $\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r$ if and only if $o(f)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = 0$.

(The r-dimensional 'matrix' $o(f)$ is called *the obstruction cocycle*.)

Proof that $v(f) = o(f)$. Extend the map $f^r|_{\partial(\sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r)}$ to a general position PL map $F\colon \sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \sigma_r \to (\mathbb{R}^d)^r$. Then $v(f)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r) = \mathrm{im}\, F \bullet \mathrm{diag} = o(f)(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ [MW, Lemma 27.d]. Here $\mathrm{im}\, F \bullet \mathrm{diag}$ is the sum of the 2-intersection signs of $\mathrm{im}\, F$ and diag, both having natural orientation.

Proof of the 'only if' part of Proposition 3.6. (This part is not required for Theorem 3.4.) Since $o(f) = v(f) = 0$, the Σ_r-equivariant map $\pi \circ f^r$ defined on the codimension 1 skeleton of $\widetilde{K}^r$ extends to a Σ_r-equivariant map $\widetilde{K}^r \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$.

Proof of the 'if' part of Proposition 3.6. This is the most non-trivial part of Proposition 3.6, so this could be omitted for the first reading.

The existence of a Σ_r-equivariant map $\widetilde{K}^r \to S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ implies that the r-dimensional 'matrix' $o(f)$ is *equivariantly null-cohomologous* [Hu, Sk15, Sk, Di]. Since $v(f) = o(f)$, the r-dimensional 'matrix' $v(f)$ is also equivariantly null-cohomologous. Then we obtain from f a $\mathbb{Z}$-almost r-embedding $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ using higher-multilplicty generalization [MW, Corollary 44] of van Kampen finger moves corresponding to *elementary coboundaries* [Fo], [Sk, §§4.7-4.9] (cf. fig. 6.V).



Figure 6: For map of a graph to the plane: II — Whitney trick, V —Van Kampen finger move

3.5 Proof of the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3: multiple Whitney trick

In this section we shorten $f(x)$ to fx.

The following result is interesting in itself, and in simple terms illuminates 'the core' of the proof of Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.9 (Local Disjunction)**.** *Let $D = D_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup D_r$ be the disjoint union of r disks of dimension $3(r-1)$ and $f : D \to D^{3r}$ a general position PL map to the $3r$-ball such that*

$$f^{-1}\partial D^{3r} = \partial D \quad \text{and} \quad fD_1 \bullet \ldots \bullet fD_r = 0.$$

(Here $fD_1 \bullet \ldots \bullet fD_r$ is the sum of the r-intersection signs of all global r-fold points $y \in fD_1 \cap \ldots \cap fD_r$.)

Then there exists a general position PL map $g : D \to D^{3r}$ such that $g^{-1}\partial D^{3r} = \partial D$, $g = f$ on ∂D and $gD_1 \cap \ldots \cap gD_r = \emptyset$.

The case $r = 2$ is the well known *double* Whitney trick [RS] (cf. fig. 6.II). The main idea of proof for $r > 2$ [MW], [AMSW, §2] is to invent an r-tuple analogue of Whitney trick, i.e. the analogue for higher-multiplicity intersections. Why this analogue is non-trivial? Take $r = 3$. If two triple points of opposite signs in $fD_1 \cap fD_2 \cap fD_3$ are contained in one connected component of $fD_1 \cap fD_2$, then we can 'cancel' them by double Whitney trick applied to $fD_1 \cap fD_2$ and fD_3 (see fig. 7.a, where fD_1 is the square section and fD_2, fD_3 are curvilinear sections). If not (fig. 7.b), then we need to first achieve this property by an analogue of double Whitney trick applied to fD_1 and fD_2. This is analogous to 'surgery of the intersection' $fD_1 \cap fD_2$, see details in §3.2, in Lemmas 3.11, 3.12 below and in [AMSW, Remark 1.16.a].



Figure 7: Whitney trick for $r = 3$

More precisely, the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem 3.3 is easily deduced by induction [AMSW, §1.3] from the following Theorem 3.10.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $f : K \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ be a general position PS map of a $3(r-1)$-complex K, let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ be pairwise disjoint simplices of K, and $x, y \in f\sigma_1 \cap \dots \cap f\sigma_r$ two global r-fold points of opposite r-intersections signs.*

Then there is a general position PS map $g\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ such that $f = g$ on $K - \mathrm{Int}(\sigma_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \sigma_r)$, and, if z is a global r-fold point of g, then z is a global r-fold point of f and $z \notin \{x, y\}$.

The Local Disjunction Theorem 3.9 is proved analogously.

Throughout this section, let us fix orientations on disks D^m.

For Theorem 3.10 we need the following lemmas, of which the first lemma is known (see references in the paragraph after Theorem 3.9).

Lemma 3.11 (Embedded Surgery)**.** *Assume that $d - 3 \geq p, q$ and that $f : D^p \to D^d$, $g : D^q \to D^d$ are proper general position embeddings such that $fD^p \cap gD^q$ is a proper submanifold (possibly disconnected) of D^d containing points x, y.*

(a) If $p + q > d$ then there is a proper general position map $f' : D^p \to D^d$ such that

- *$f' = f$ on ∂D^p and on a neighborhood of $\{f^{-1}x, f^{-1}y\}$;*
- *x, y lie in the interior of an embedded $(p + q - d)$-disk contained in $f'D^p \cap gD^q$.*

(b) If $p + q = d$ and if x, y have opposite 2-intersection sign, then there is a general position map $f' : D^p \to D^d$ such that $f' = f$ on ∂D^p and $f'D^p \cap gD^q = (fD^p \cap gD^q) - \{x, y\}$.

Lemma 3.12. *Assume that $r \geq 2$,*

- *K is a finite $3(r-1)$-dimensional simplicial complex,*
- *$f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ a general position PL map,*
- *$\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ are pairwise disjoint simplices of K,*
- *$x, y \in f\sigma_1 \cap \dots \cap f\sigma_r \subset \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ are two global r-fold points of opposite r-intersections signs.*

Then for each $n = 1, \dots, r-1$ there is a general position PL map $f'\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ such that

- $f = f'$ *on* $K - \operatorname{Int}(\sigma_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \sigma_r)$,
- x, y *lie in the interior of an embedded* $3(r-n)$*-disk contained in* $f'\sigma_1 \cap \ldots \cap f'\sigma_n$*, and*
- *if* z *is a global* r*-fold point of* f'*, then* z *is a global* r*-fold point of* f*.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on n. The base $n = 1$ follows by setting $f' = f$. The required disk is then a small regular neighborhood in $f\sigma_1$ of a path in $f\sigma_1$ joining x to y and avoiding the self-intersection set $\{x \in K \ : \ |f^{-1}fx| \geq 2\}$ of f.

In order to prove the inductive step assume that $n \geq 2$ and the points x, y lie in the interior of an embedded $3(r-n+1)$-disk $\sigma_- \subset f\sigma_1 \cap \ldots \cap f\sigma_{n-1}$. By general position

$$\dim(\sigma_- \cap f\sigma_n) \leq k(r-n+1) + k(r-1) - kr = k(r-n).$$

Since f-preimages of x lie in the interiors of $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$, the intersections of $f\sigma_i$ and small regular neighborhoods of x, y in B equal to the intersections of affine spaces and the neighborhoods. Hence the regular neighborhoods of x, y in $\sigma_- \cap f\sigma_n$ are $3(r-n)$-balls.

Take points x', y' in such balls. Take general position paths $\lambda_+ \subset f \operatorname{Int} \sigma_n$ and $\lambda_- \subset \sigma_-$ joining x' to y'. By general position dimension of the self-intersection set of f does not exceed $6(r-1) - 3r < 3(r-1) - 1$. So the union $\lambda_+ \cup \lambda_-$ is an embedded circle in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$. Since $r \geq 2$, we have $3r \geq 4$. Hence by general position this circle bounds an embedded 2-disk $\delta \subset \mathbb{R}^{3r}$. Since $3(r-1)+2 < 3r$, by general position $\delta \cap fK = \lambda_+ \cup \lambda_-$. Let $O\delta$ be a small regular neighborhood of δ in $\mathbb{R}^{3r}$. Then $O\delta$ is a $3r$-ball and $f^{-1}\beta$ is the union of

- a regular neighborhood $D_n \cong D^{3(r-1)}$ of the arc $f|_{\sigma_n}^{-1}\lambda_+$ in σ_n;
- regular neighborhoods $D_i \cong D^{3(r-1)}$ of the arcs $f|_{\sigma_i}^{-1}\lambda_-$ in σ_i for each $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Then $f|_{D_i} : D_i \to O\delta$ is proper for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, and $O\delta \cap f\sigma_-$ is a proper $3(r-n+1)$-ball in $O\delta$. Since $n \geq 2$, by general position all global n-fold points of f in $O\delta$ are contained in $fD_1 \cap \ldots \cap fD_n$.

Since the regular neighborhoods of x, y in $\sigma_- \cap f\sigma_n$ are $3(r-n)$-balls, the set $O\delta \cap f\sigma_- \cap fD_n$ is a proper $3(r-n)$-submanifold of $O\delta$. Hence we can apply the Embedded Surgery Lemma 3.11 to fD_n and $O\delta \cap f\sigma_-$ in $O\delta$. For the obtained map $f' : D_n \to O\delta$ the points $x, y \in f'\sigma_1 \cap \ldots \cap f'\sigma_r$ are two global r-fold points of opposite r-intersections signs, lying in the interior of an embedded $3(r-n)$-disk contained in $\sigma_- \cap f'D_n$. Extend f' by f outside D_n. Clearly, the first two bullet points in the conclusion of Lemma 3.12 are fulfilled. Since all global n-fold points of f in $O\delta$ are contained in $fD_1 \cap \ldots \cap fD_n$, the disk $f'D_n$ may only form global n-fold points of f'. Since $n < r$, the third bullet point in the conclusion of Lemma 3.12 is fulfilled. Thus the map f' is as required. □

Proof of Theorem 3.10. By Lemma 3.12 for $n = r-1$ we may assume that the points x, y lie in the interior of an embedded 3-disk $\sigma_- \subset f\sigma_1 \cap \ldots \cap f\sigma_{r-1}$. Choose orientations of $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{r-1}$. These orientations define an orientation on σ_- (this is analogous to the definition of the r-intersection sign given in §3.1, cf. [MW, §2.2] for a longer formal exposition). Since $x, y \in f\sigma_1 \cap \ldots \cap f\sigma_r$ have opposite r-intersections signs, $x, y \in f\sigma_- \cap f\sigma_r$ have opposite 2-intersections signs [MW, Lemma 27.cd].

Analogously to the proof of Lemma 3.12 (except that we start from x, y not from x', y') we construct a $3r$-ball $O\delta \subset \mathbb{R}^{3r}$ and $3(r-1)$-disks $D_i \subset \operatorname{Int} \sigma_i$ such that $x, y \in O\delta$ and $f|_{D_i} : D_i \to O\delta$ is proper. Then $O\delta$ intersects the set of global $(r-1)$-fold points of f by a neighborhood of λ_- in σ_-.

Since $3r \geq \dim \sigma_- + 3$, we can apply the Embedded Surgery Lemma 3.11.b to fD_n and $O\delta \cap f\sigma_-$ in $O\delta$. For the obtained map fD_n we have $\sigma_- \cap f'D_n = \emptyset$. Extend f' by f outside D_n. Clearly, $f = f'$ on $K - \operatorname{Int}(\sigma_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup \sigma_r)$, and x, y are not global r-fold points of f'. Since $O\delta$ intersects the set of global $(r-1)$-fold points of f by a neighborhood of λ_- in σ_-, the map f' is as required. □

This proof can be generalized to a simple proof of the 'codimension 2' and the 'metastable' versions [AMSW, MW', MW16, Sk17].

4 Appendix: comparison to another exposition

Here I compare exposition of this paper to an exposition of [BZ]. Remarks (2), (3) and (6) below concern references to previous publications and to an alternative point of view; they are accessible even to non-mathematicians. Most of other remarks are accessible to non-specialists. Remarks (1)-(6) below concern exposition of references, cf. §3.2. Remarks (1) and (7)-(11) below concern exposition of proofs, cf. §2.3 and §3.3.

It would be nice to replace this appendix, in later versions of this paper, by a result of discussion of references on topological Tverberg conjecture, cf. Historical Remark 4.1 below.

Below references to pages, sections, paragraphs, numbered statements and to numbered citations refer to [BZ]. Lettered citations refer to citations of this paper; [Sk4] is this paper.

(1) A map $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}^d$ of a simplicial complex is an *almost r-embedding* if $f(\sigma_1)\cap\ldots\cap f(\sigma_r) = \emptyset$ whenever $\sigma_1,\ldots,\sigma_r$ are pairwise disjoint simplices of K.

Constraint Lemma. (Gromov, Blagojević, Frick, Ziegler, [BBZ, Theorem in p. 736], cf. [Sk4, Lemma 3.2]) *If k, r are integers and there is an almost r-embedding of the $k(r-1)$-skeleton of the $(kr+2)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{kr}$, then there is an almost r-embedding of the $(kr+2)(r-1)$-simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{kr+1}$.*

I suggest to explicitly state this Lemma, and present its proof.

Currently the lemma is not stated, and is proved separately for r a prime power (§4.1) or not (§5.2) in the proof of other results; neither case of the lemma uses the fact that r is a prime power or not. This is misleading, cf. remark (4) below.

Although explicit statement and proof not repeated twice will make exposition only a a little shorter, this will make exposition substantially clearer.

(2) §1, 2nd paragraph: '*The topological Tverberg conjecture was extended to the case when r is a prime power by Murad Özaydin in an unpublished paper from 1987 [38].*'

I suggest to add a reference [47] to the *first published* proof, otherwise the sentence is misleading. [7]

(3) P. 2, the 1st sentence: '*In a spectacular recent development, Isaac Mabillard and Uli Wagner [31, 32] have developed an r-fold version of the classical 'Whitney trick'...*'

I suggest to add something like 'see [Sk4, third paragraph of §3.2] (this is footnote 2 from versions 1-3 of [Sk4]) for relation of Mabillard-Wagner idea to earlier references'. Although this explanation justifies that Mabillard-Wagner's work is spectacular, the above sentence is misleading without indicating relations to previous publications. [8]

(4) P. 2, the 1st paragraph: '*...which yields the failure of the generalized Van Kampen-Flores theorem when $r \geq 6$ is not a prime power. Then Florian Frick observed that this indeed implies the existence of counter-examples to the topological Tverberg conjecture [26] [13], by a lemma of Gromov [27, p. 445]...*'

This is misleading because the lemma of Gromov (i.e. Constraint Lemma above) states that the topological Tverberg conjecture implies the generalized Van Kampen-Flores theorem [BBZ, Theorem in p. 736]. So it is hidden that F. Frick is being credited for 'observing that $\overline{B} \Rightarrow \overline{A}$ by a lemma asserting that $A \Rightarrow B$'. This is unfair to F. Frick: I suppose no mathematician would like being credited for this. I suggest to write that Frick's important achievement was rediscovery of the Constraint Lemma, of which the wide community of topological combinatorics was not aware, and thus the codimension 3 restriction of Mabillard-Wagner was considered a serious obstacle before Frick.

(5) §5, 1st paragraph. This is misleading and unfair to F. Frick, see (4). I suggest to modify this paragraph consistently with suggestion to (4).

(6) I suggest to refer in §1 to other expositions of references concerning disproof of topological Tverberg conjecture, including [Sk4] and [JVZ]. If the authors disagree with those expositions,

[7] The authors responded to this suggestion of [Sk2, §5] on [BZ1] by keeping the above statement in the same form and citing [47] in §3.3 not in §1. Thus a reference to the first published proof was hidden.

[8] The authors responded to this suggestion [Sk2, §5] on [BZ1] by citing the Whitney 1944 paper and thus ignoring many later references cited in [Sk4, third paragraph of §3.2].

it would be very valuable if they explain in their survey which sentences exactly they disagree with, and why (cf. remarks (2)-(4) above). It is misleading to ignore those references. [9]

(7) The most complicated (and thus the most interesting!) part of disproof of topological Tverberg conjecture is the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem in p. 24-25. Lack of idea and plan of the proof of this result is an annoying gap in a survey intended to cover topological Tverberg conjecture. I suggest to add idea and plan of the proof, at least up to the extent given in [Sk2, §4]. In fact, an alternative complete proof in [3, §2], [Sk4, §3.5] (or in earlier versions) is shorter than the included proof of Theorem 3.11.

(8) A survey on the 'holy grain' topological Tverberg conjecture will be interesting to a wide audience of mathematicians. Most of them would have only a vague idea of what spectral sequences or equivariant obstructions are. So proofs of most important results of the survey (the topological Tverberg conjecture for prime powers r and an important step towards a counterexample, Theorems 3.11 and 5.1 of Özaydin-Volovikov and Özaydin) are completely unaccessible to them. It is annoying that the exposition in §3 of this *survey* [BZ] is harder to follow than the exposition of the same results in original *research* papers [8, 38, 47].

Theorems 3.11 and 5.1 are striking results worth an attempt to write 'proof from the book' by such masters of clear exposition as Blagoević and Ziegler. In order to understand their proofs *in full details* one needs of course spectral sequences and equivariant obstructions. However, the proofs can be structured so as to make *the plan* and some parts of the proof accessible to non-specialists [Sk4, §2.3, §3.3] (earlier versions: [Sk2, §3], [Sk3, §2.3, §5]). (Then the complete proofs will be easier to read for a specialist.) This can be achieved by *stating explicitly* a result proved by a theory in terms not involving this theory.

The proof of Theorem 3.11 starts with spectral sequences (p. 11). This antagonizes non-specialists (in algebraic topology) because they do not know this notion, and neither a reference nor dictionary explains it. This also antagonizes specialists because they can easily do exercises involving spectral sequences, once the statements [Sk4, Lemma 2.8] are explicitly given, so what they want is proof modulo these lemmas.

Even for a specialist it is hard to read the 3-page proof of Theorem 3.11 because it is not well-structured. E.g. in p. 12 before the localization theorem it is proved that the map in cohomology is a monomorphism, and after the localization theorem it is observed that it is not, so it seems that we already have a contradiction and (4) is not required. The problem is that there is a statement ('$a \neq 0$') which is proved from the contrary, but neither this statement nor its proof is split from the remaining text.

I also suggest avoiding unnecessary sophisticated language. E.g. although $S(W_r^{\oplus d})$ is a standard notation for specialists, I suggest to change it to the simple-minded notation $S^{d(r-1)-1}_{\Sigma_r}$ defined as the set of real $d \times r$-matrices with sum in each row zero, and the sum of squares of the matrix elements equal to 1 [Sk2]. Then the phrases like second bullet points in p. 10, p. 21 and p. 23 will be unnecessary, the reader would not have to consult dictionary for '$(N-r)$-simple', and the Dold Theorem in p. 10 can be stated for $Y = S^n$. All this would make the matter more accessible.

(9) P. 11-12, Proof of Theorem 3.11, p. 23, Proof of Theorem 5.1. The notation is unreadable, see display formulas. It is easy to keep the notation short [Sk4, §2.3, §3.3] (earlier versions: [Sk2, §3], [Sk3, §2.3, §5]).

(10) §1, 2nd paragraph: *'...with complete proofs for all of the results...'*. This is misleading because many theorems (of Dold, Leray, Mabillard-Wagner, etc) are used without proofs.

(11) The dictionary at the end of the paper [BZ] does not contain some definitions used in the paper and unknown to non-specialists. E.g. 'spectral sequences' from p. 11 on; the symbols $\mathcal{H}$ in pp. 11, 22, 23, 34 (for cohomology with twisted coefficients) are not defined; this makes definitions of 'primary obstruction', 'exact obstruction sequence', 'obstruction element' in p. 34 unclear.

[9] The authors responded to this suggestion of [Sk2, §5] on [BZ1] by citing [42]=[Sk4] only in p. 24, in connection with the Mabillard-Wagner Theorem not with the history of disproof of topological Tverberg conjecture. Thus a reference to a different point of view was hidden.

Those definitions the dictionary does contain, are given in more generality than required for this survey, which makes it harder to follow.

Terms defined in the dictionary are sometimes used without references to the dictionary (e.g. §1, line 4: 'n-connected').

So the dictionary is almost of no use to non-specialist.

Remark 4.1 (Historical)**.** Preliminary version of the current paper was sent in April 2016 to the authors of [Öz, Gr10, Fr, MW, BFZ14, Ka, JVZ]. Besides approvals, I received letters implying that the description of references in current §3.1 is not proper. I asked the authors of these letters to explain which sentences in the description are not proper and why. I also asked to state their opinion, if different from mine, for citation in this paper. Since then, I received neither explanations nor statements to be cited.

Remarks (1)-(6) above (in a bit different form [Sk2, §5]) were sent to P. Blagojević and G. Ziegler in May 2016. These remarks we published in July 2016 [Sk2, §5] (for reasons explained in [Sk2, footnote 7]).

Remarks (1)-(11) above on [BZ] almost coincide with remarks from my second report (October 2016) on an update of [BZ1]. (The update was prepared after remarks of [Sk2, §5] from the first report, and other remarks by myself and by other referees. A small number of remarks above appeared as results of authors' work on remarks from the second report.) My reports were prepared on request of the Editors M. Loebl, J. Nešetřil and R. Thomas of *'A Journey through Discrete Mathematics. A Tribute to Jiři Matoušek'*. They advised referees to apply high standards for survey papers in terms of clarity of exposition, appropriate for a top combinatorial journal. So in my second report I wrote: *I cannot recommend the paper in its present form for publication in a top combinatorial journal requiring high standards for survey papers in terms of clarity of exposition. (I am afraid remarks (4), (5) and (6) prevent publication in any scientific journal.) I recommend either rejection or major revision of the paper.*

The exposition of references from §3.2 and the above Remarks (1)-(6) were never publicly criticized. However, the paper [BZ] (not containing proper references to earlier results and to an alternative point of view) was accepted. The paper [JVZ] was rejected from the same publication, and among important reasons for rejection the anonymous referees named that description of references in [JVZ] is inconsistent with those of [BZ].

References

[AMSW] S. Avvakumov, I. Mabillard, A. Skopenkov and U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, III. Codimension 2, Arxiv:1511.03501

[BB] E. G. Bajmóczy and I. Bárány, On a common generalization of Borsuk's and Radon's theorem, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 34 (1979), no. 3, 347-350.

[BBZ] I. Bárány, P. V. M. Blagojević and G. M. Ziegler. Tverberg's Theorem at 50: Extensions and Counterexamples, Notices of the AMS, 63:7 (2016), 732–739. `http://www.ams.org/journals/notices/201607`

[BE] V. Boltyanskiy, V. Efremovich. Intuitive Combinatorial Topology, Springer, 2001

[BFZ] P. V. M. Blagojević, F. Frick and G. M. Ziegler, Barycenters of Polytope Skeleta and Counterexamples to the Topological Tverberg Conjecture, via Constraints, Arxiv:1510.07984

[BFZ14] P. V. M. Blagojević, F. Frick and G. M. Ziegler, Tverberg plus constraints, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 46 (2014), no. 5, 953-967, Arxiv:1401.0690

[BLZ] P. V. M. Blagojević, W. Lück and G. M. Ziegler, Equivariant topology of configuration spaces, J. of Topology, 8 (2015), 414-456, Arxiv:1207.2852

[Br] K. S. Brown. Cohomology of Groups Springer-Verlag New York, 1982.

[BShSz] I. Bárány, S. B. Shlosman, and A. Szűcs, On a topological generalization of a theorem of Tverberg, J. London Math. Soc. (II. Ser.) 23 (1981), 158–164.

[BZ] P. V. M. Blagojević and G. M. Ziegler, Beyond the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: The topological Tverberg story, Arxiv:1605.07321v2

[BZ1] P. V. M. Blagojević and G. M. Ziegler, Beyond the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: The topological Tverberg story, Arxiv:1605.07321v1

[CRS] M. Cencelj, D. Repovš and M. Skopenkov, *Classification of knotted tori in the 2-metastable dimension,* Mat. Sbornik, 203:11 (2012), 1654-1681. Arxiv:0811.2745.

[Di] T. tom Dieck, Transformation groups, Studies in Mathematics, vol. 8, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1987.

[FKT] M. H. Freedman, V. S. Krushkal and P. Teichner, Van Kampen's embedding obstruction is incomplete for 2-complexes in $\mathbb{R}^4$, Math. Res. Letters 1 (1994), 167–176.

[FF] A.T. Fomenko and D.B. Fuchs. A course in homotopy theory (in Russian). Moscow: Nauka, 1989. English translation of a preliminary edition: Budapest, AK, 1986.

[Fo] R. Fokkink. A forgotten mathematician, European Mathematical Society Newsletter 52 (2004) 9–14. `http://www.ems-ph.org/journals/newsletter/pdf/2004-06-52.pdf`

[Fr] F. Frick, Counterexamples to the topological Tverberg conjecture, Arxiv:1502.00947

[Gr86] M. Gromov, Partial Differential Relations, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), Springer Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1986.

[Gr10] M. Gromov, Singularities, expanders and topology of maps. Part 2: From combinatorics to topology via algebraic isoperimetry, Geometric and Functional Analysis 20:2 (2010), 416–526.

[GS] P. M. Gruber and R. Schneider. Problems in geometric convexity. In *Contributions to geometry (Proc. Geom. Sympos., Siegen, 1978)*, 255–278. Birkhäuser, Basel-Boston, Mass., 1979.

[Ha62] A. Haefliger, *Knotted* $(4k-1)$*-spheres in* $6k$*-space*, Ann. of Math. 75 (1962) 452–466.

[Ha63] A. Haefliger *Plongements differentiables dans le domain stable*, Comment. Math. Helv. 36 (1962-63), 155–176.

[HK] N. Habegger and U. Kaiser, *Link homotopy in 2–metastable range*, Topology 37:1 (1998) 75–94.

[Hu] S. T. Hu, Homotopy Theory, Academic Press, New York, 1959

[JVZ] D. Jojić, S. T. Vrećica, R. T. Živaljević, Topology and combinatorics of 'unavoidable complexes', Arxiv:1603.08472

[Ka] G. Kalai, From Oberwolfach: The Topological Tverberg Conjecture is False, 'Combinatorics and more' blog post, February 6, 2015, `gilkalai.wordpress.com`

[Lo] M. de Longueville. Notes on the topological Tverberg theorem. Discrete Math. 247 (2002), no. 1–3, 271–297. (The paper first appeared in Discrete Math. 241 (2001) 207–233, but the original version suffered from serious publisher's typesetting errors.).

[Ma] J. Matoušek. Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem: Lectures on topological methods in combinatorics and geometry. Springer Verlag, 2003.

[Me] S. Melikhov, Gauss type formulas for link map invariants, unpublished.

[MW] I. Mabillard and U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, I. A Whitney Trick for Tverberg-Type Problems, Arxiv:1508.02349

[MW'] I. Mabillard and U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, II. The Deleted Product Criterion in the r-Metastable Range, Arxiv: 1601.00876

[MW14] I. Mabillard and U. Wagner, Eliminating Tverberg Points, I. An Analogue of the Whitney Trick, Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG'14), pp. 171-180, ACM, New York, 2014.

[MW16] I. Mabillard and U. Wagner. Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, II. The Deleted Product Criterion in the r-Metastable Range, Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG'16).

[Öz] M. Özaydin. Equivariant maps for the symmetric group, unpublished manuscript (1987), available online at `http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/63829`.

[PW] I. Pak, S. Wilson, Geometric realizations of polyhedral complexes, `http://www.math.ucla.edu/~pak/papers/Fary-full31.pdf`

[RS] C. P. Rourke and B. J. Sanderson, Introduction to Piecewise-Linear Topology, *Ergebn. der Math.* 69, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.

[Sa] K. S. Sarkaria. Tverberg partitions and Borsuk-Ulam theorems. Pacific J. Math., 196:1 (2000) 231–241.

[Si] S. Simon, Average-Value Tverberg Partitions via Finite Fourier Analysis, Arxiv:1501.04612

[Sk] A. Skopenkov, Algebraic Topology From Algorithmic Viewpoint, in Russian, predraftoid of a book, `www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/algor.pdf`

[Sk08] A. Skopenkov, Embedding and knotting of manifolds in Euclidean spaces, in: Surveys in Contemporary Mathematics, Ed. N. Young and Y. Choi, London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes, 347 (2008) 248–342. Arxiv:math/0604045

[Sk14] A. Skopenkov, Realizability of hypergraphs and Ramsey link theory, Arxiv:1402.0658

[Sk15] A. Skopenkov, Algebraic Topology From Geometric Viewpoint, in Russian, MCCME, Moscow, 2015. `http://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/home/combtop13.htm#photo`

[Sk17] A. Skopenkov, Eliminating higher-multiplicity intersections in the metastable dimension range, privately distributed draft.

[Sk2] A. Skopenkov, A user's guide to topological Tverberg conjecture, Arxiv:1605.05141v2

[Sk3] A. Skopenkov, A user's guide to topological Tverberg conjecture, Arxiv:1605.05141v3

[Sk'] A. Skopenkov, On the metastable Mabillard-Wagner conjecture, Arxiv:1702.04259.

[Vo] A. Yu. Volovikov, On a topological generalization of the Tverberg theorem. Mathematical Notes 59:3 (1996), 324-326.

[Vo'] A. Yu. Volovikov, On the van Kampen-Flores Theorem. Mathematical Notes 59:5 (1996), 477-481.

[Zi98] R. T. Živaljević. User's guide to equivariant methods in combinatorics. II. Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.), 64(78) (1998) 107-132.

[Zi11] G. M. Ziegler, 3N Colored Points in a Plane, Notices of the AMS, 58:4 (2011), 550-557. `http://www.ams.org/notices/201104/rtx110400550p.pdf`